

REMARKS

This application pertains to novel self-adhesive mouldings (page 17, lines 1-15; claim 1). The mouldings are produced in various ways, such as by molds, compression molds, blow molds and the like. The mouldings are three-dimensional articles of manufacture, such as pads, heart-shaped molds and the like, which are self-adhesive.

Although comprised of pressure-sensitive adhesive materials, the inventive articles are mouldings, not self-adhesive coatings.

Claims 1-8 are pending; the Examiner having refused to enter claims 9-11 which were proposed in the previous response.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner contends that Applicants' mouldings are essentially identical to the adhesive coatings on the adhesive tapes of the references. In particular, the Examiner refers to page 9, lines 4-7 of the specification, where Applicants coat their adhesive material onto a release paper. This, according to her, is the same as an adhesive tape. Also, the Examiner refers to page 17, lines 1-5, where Applicants indicate that the mouldings can have any shape and any dimensions.

The Examiner is focusing on only one step in producing Applicants' final product, however. A more complete reading of the cited language will show that Applicants' mouldings cannot in any way be seen as being identical to or obvious variants of an adhesive coating. In this regard, the adhesive that is coated onto the release paper on

page 9, lines 4 and 5 *is not* an example of Applicants' product. The Examiner overlooks the following steps, where a laminate is produced from the adhesive strips, to produce a laminate having three strips, each of which has a weight of 130 g/m<sup>2</sup>. Thus, the laminate produced has a weight of 390 g/m<sup>2</sup>.

Adhesive coatings, on the other hand, are clearly exemplified in all the Husemann references cited as having coat weights of e.g. 50 g/m<sup>2</sup>. The WO reference shows 1 mil thick coatings (page 36, line 24).

The relatively thin *coatings* of the references are therefore different than and non-suggestive of Applicants' *mouldings*. The two products are completely different in form and structure. To hold that Applicants' moulding is the same thing as the adhesive coatings of the references is almost the same as holding that a brick is the same thing as a building made of bricks.

Clearly Applicants' mouldings are not anticipated by the coatings of the references cited, and the final rejection should be withdrawn.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

#### CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME


If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account

No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,  
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By   
William C. Gerstenzang  
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/zs  
Enclosure- Petition for Extension of Time (1 sheet)  
875 Third Avenue, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 808-0700

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile, no (703) 872-9306 to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 10, 2005.

By   
Zsuzsa Schuster

Date May 10, 2005